

Video assessment module: self, peer, and teacher post-performance assessment for learning

Matthew Cotter¹ and Don Hinkelman²

Abstract. Assessing student presentations can be made more reliable with video-recording and post-performance rating. Further, self assessment and peer assessment can aid in the learning process by students when using specific, easy-to-understand rubrics. A ten-year action research study involved video-recorded performance assessment tasks using a free, open-source Moodle module developed by Sapporo Gakuin University. The Video Assessment Module (VAM) allowed teachers to video record English presentations and upload them to the module for students for self and peer assessment on specific rubrics using qualitative and quantitative criteria. When compared to paper rubrics, the VAM reduced teacher management time and students could use out-of-class time to assess asynchronously without time pressure. Results showed that there was a higher difference in teacher variance for self assessment when compared to teacher variance with peer assessment. Qualitative and quantitative results reported value in using the tool by both students and teachers. This study also showed that students can be trained to use online rubrics to score presentations efficiently, giving further validity for using and developing online modules for video assessment.

Keywords: video assessment, presentation skills, performance assessment, rubrics, Moodle, self assessment, peer assessment.

1. Introduction

In performance-based learning, comprehensively assessing large numbers of students on given individual performances has long been a tedious and even unproductive

1. Hokusei Gakuen University Junior College, Sapporo, Japan; m-cotter@hokusei.ac.jp; <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0906-1400>
2. Sapporo Gakuin University, Ebetsu, Japan; hinkel@sgu.ac.jp

How to cite this article: Cotter, M., & Hinkelman, D. (2019). Video assessment module: self, peer, and teacher post-performance assessment for learning. In F. Meunier, J. Van de Vyver, L. Bradley & S. Thouéšny (Eds), *CALL and complexity – short papers from EUROCALL 2019* (pp. 94-99). Research-publishing.net. <https://doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2019.38.992>

quest for educators throughout second language education. Furthermore, [Gardner \(2012\)](#) proposed that for learners to learn from the assessment, they needed to be part of the process. This led to practices such as self and peer assessment, both in score-giving and qualitative feedback.

[Nicol, Thomson, and Breslin \(2014\)](#) surveyed peer feedback research and observed that effects on both the receiver of peer feedback and the giver of peer feedback need to be examined. Based on these principles, the main research question of this study was whether online tools could be used and developed to aid in the process of post-performance self and peer assessment. Secondly, could participation in this type of self and peer assessment aid in improving future English as a Foreign Language (EFL) presentation performance for students? Other pertinent research questions such as the use of other feedback tools (paper, face-to-face), and timing of assessing (real time versus post-performance) are summarized in earlier action research by [Rian, Hinkelman, and McGarty \(2012\)](#), [Rian, Hinkelman, and Cotter \(2015\)](#), and [Hinkelman and Cotter \(2018\)](#). However, for the purpose of this study, results pertaining to the 2019 development cycle of online video assessment tools will be addressed.

2. Method

2.1. Course background

Each year, course participants comprise 50-60 second year English major students and two teachers at Sapporo Gakuin University. Students engage in a compulsory oral English presentation skills class titled ‘Oral Communication C’. During weekly 90 minute classes over a single semester of 15 weeks, students were required to prepare for and deliver five presentations on varying themes such as giving instructions (speech to inform) or Hokkaido sightseeing recommendations (speech to persuade). Participation levels were high in these top two levels of classes (2019 n=34) with 87% in-class attendance rate and an average rate of nine out of ten out-of-class homework quizzes. The research question involved whether students could be trained to assess using online rubrics and whether they found value in the process.

After the decision in 2009 to move from paper rubrics to online tools for assessment, the teaching team of this course spent ten years researching, developing, improving, and reporting on assessment types (paper, verbal, online), assessment

groupings (self, peer, class, teacher), and tools (Moodle learning management system, forum module, VAM) blended in an EFL speech communication class, as outlined in [supplementary materials, part A](#). Funding for the module development was provided by internal university grants and seed funding by universities in the Moodle Association of Japan.

2.2. VAM functions

Using the Moodle VAM, teachers or students could upload presentation videos directly to Moodle and students could watch them while completing self and/or peer assessments on predetermined rubrics, simple at first, and becoming more complex late in the course. Comments could also be made for each criteria and or as a whole. The teacher could also assess and separate weightings for self, peer, and teacher scores respectively. [Figure 1](#) below shows a screen with a video-recording playback window for both teacher and student viewing while rubric scales are checked and brief comments are made.

2.3. Data collection

Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected in 2019, as done in previous cycles. Overall scores could be downloaded from the Moodle gradebook and the VAM directly and statistical analysis performed via Excel as shown in [Table 1](#) below.

In addition, end of course voluntary student satisfaction surveys ([supplementary materials, part B](#)) were given using the questionnaire module in Moodle. Qualitative data from students was also collected through the surveys and the Moodle Forum module helped collate qualitative data for the focus group of the teachers by recording weekly comments in a teaching journal.

Table 1. Self, peer, teacher, and overall assessment average scores (out of 100) with teacher variances

Presentation	Average Scores (Presentations 1-5)		
	2014 (n=55~63)	2017 (n=34~49)	2019 (n=34)
Self	66.0	75.9	77.8
Variance with teacher	-8.8	-9.0	- 8.2
Peer	73.6	N/A*	84.5
Variance with teacher	-1.3		- 1.5
Teacher	74.9	84.8	86.3

* In 2017, a timetable change required peer assessment to be dropped in order to reduce student workload

Figure 1. VAM rubric and comment feedback interface

	Grading:	Presentation 2				No papers are allowed	
Posture & Face	Moving too much 0 points	2 points	4 points	6 points	8 points	Standing straight, calm, smiling 10 points	
Eye contact	Never eye contact 0 points	2 points	4 points	6 points	8 points	Always eye contact 10 points	Perfect!
Gestures - Simple, Counting	No simple or counting gestures 0 points	2 points	4 points	6 points	8 points	Many gestures (8+) 10 points	
Gestures - Action	Few or no gestures 0 points	2 points	4 points	6 points	8 points	Many action gestures (5+) 10 points	
Voice Volume	Too quiet 0 points	2 points	4 points	Normal voice 100% 6 points	8 points	Big voice 150% 10 points	A little louder
Voice Change - Stress, stretch, pause	flat, monotone 0 points	4 points	8 points	12 points	16 points	Much stress, dramatic pause 20 points	Try to stress important words more
Words	Difficult to understand 0 points	4 points	8 points	12 points	16 points	Easy to understand, enjoyable 20 points	
Memory	Many pauses 0 points	2 points	4 points	6 points	8 points	Good memory, smooth 10 points	



Current grade in gradebook: 92%

Save changes
Cancel

3. Discussion

Results from online learner assessment scores are consistent with those of previous years. Students continue to score themselves lower on post-performance assessment tasks than teachers on all presentations. An average total over the five presentations saw self assessments 8.2-9.0% lower than teacher assessments in the respective years, compared to only a 1.3-1.5 lower average difference by peers respectively. Students did not try to raise their score, but graded themselves more severely than their teachers. This is consistent with the general tendency of Japanese students to rate themselves modestly (Hinkelman & Cotter, 2018). Due to this high variance between teacher and self-ratings, a lower weighting of 20% was assigned to self assessment scores than to teacher scores (80%).

From the 2019 student satisfaction surveys (supplementary materials, part B) we can see that 92% of students responded positively (*agree* or *strongly agree*) to watching their own videos, and 77% valued rating their own presentations respectively. 73% found value in classmates rating their presentations, which shows strong support for using the VAM tool for assessment and learning. 92% of students also regarded feedback from the teacher as helping them improve their presentations which could portray perceived teacher expertise, experience, or comparatively more detailed feedback by teachers compared to classmates on the rubric. Interestingly, the highest value of 96% was achieved on the survey by students agreeing that watching live presentations of their classmates was helpful to improving their presentations.

4. Conclusions

Over the ten cycles (years) of action research on this oral presentation course, the evolution of post-performance video watching, along with self and peer assessment, has proven to be a successful formative tool. This most recent 2019 cycle has been no different, results showing that the VAM draws the students into a more learner-focused mode of assessment, putting Gardner's (2012) theory of 'assessment for learning' into practice. Students reported that being part of the assessment process through using the tool had helped them improve for future performances. Taking the role of 'evaluators' by using the VAM ultimately requires the students to first revisit the presentations again by viewing the videos, go through the cognitive process of scoring and giving feedback to their peers and to themselves, and finally reflect on all feedback received. We can also see that, as part of the assessment process, a complex rubric with specific criteria can be understood and used by intermediate-level students, in this case using their L2, to evaluate video-recorded student

performances in an oral presentation course. Although some cultural modesty took place, students placed enough importance on the task as not to try and purposefully score themselves or their peers higher than teachers, or wantonly assign grades due to lack of motivation or time. The convenience of the VAM being able to be used during class or out-of-class, and having the ability to create rubrics to match the assessment criteria and level of students, may have had a part to play in this.

It is our view that future cycles of this research area need to concentrate on determining the most appropriate rubric language and rubric length to match learners and also to investigate whether students themselves have any ideas on how they would like to participate in the evaluation process.

5. Acknowledgments

We would like to thank all the teachers who have contributed to the teaching and curriculum of this course, the students themselves who did ‘assessment for learning’, and finally the plugin designers and programmers who continually updated this tool for ever changing video formats and standards.

6. Supplementary materials

<https://research-publishing.box.com/s/w4ts3e0auk2pw6p60n8krb59tod4sxxrd>

References

- Gardner, J. (2012). *Assessment and learning*. Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446250808>
- Hinkelman, D., & Cotter, M. (2018). Balancing real-time vs. post-performance feedback for EFL presentation classes. In P. Clements, A. Krause & P. Bennett (Eds), *Language teaching in a global age: shaping the classroom, shaping the world*. JALT.
- Nicol, D., Thomson, A., & Breslin, C. (2014). Rethinking feedback practices in higher education: a peer review perspective. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(1), 102-122.
- Rian, J. P., Hinkelman, D., & Cotter, M. (2015). Self-, peer, and teacher rubric assessments of student presentation videos. In P. Clemens, A. Krause & H. Brown (Eds), *JALT2014 Conference Proceedings* (pp. 688-697). JALT.
- Rian, J. P., Hinkelman, D., & McGarty, G. (2012). Integrating video assessment into an oral presentation course. In A. Stewart & N. Sonda (Eds), *JALT2011 Conference Proceedings* (pp. 416-425). JALT.



Published by Research-publishing.net, a not-for-profit association
Contact: info@research-publishing.net

© 2019 by Editors (collective work)
© 2019 by Authors (individual work)

CALL and complexity – short papers from EUROCALL 2019
Edited by Fanny Meunier, Julie Van de Vyver, Linda Bradley, and Sylvie Thouéšny

Publication date: 2019/12/09

Rights: the whole volume is published under the Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives International (CC BY-NC-ND) licence; **individual articles may have a different licence.** Under the CC BY-NC-ND licence, the volume is freely available online (<https://doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2019.38.9782490057542>) for anybody to read, download, copy, and redistribute provided that the author(s), editorial team, and publisher are properly cited. Commercial use and derivative works are, however, not permitted.

Disclaimer: Research-publishing.net does not take any responsibility for the content of the pages written by the authors of this book. The authors have recognised that the work described was not published before, or that it was not under consideration for publication elsewhere. While the information in this book is believed to be true and accurate on the date of its going to press, neither the editorial team nor the publisher can accept any legal responsibility for any errors or omissions. The publisher makes no warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein. While Research-publishing.net is committed to publishing works of integrity, the words are the authors' alone.

Trademark notice: product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Copyrighted material: every effort has been made by the editorial team to trace copyright holders and to obtain their permission for the use of copyrighted material in this book. In the event of errors or omissions, please notify the publisher of any corrections that will need to be incorporated in future editions of this book.

Typeset by Research-publishing.net
Cover theme by © 2019 Frédéric Verolleman
Cover layout by © 2019 Raphaël Savina (raphael@savina.net)

Fonts used are licensed under a SIL Open Font License

ISBN13: 978-2-490057-54-2 (Ebook, PDF, colour)

ISBN13: 978-2-490057-55-9 (Ebook, EPUB, colour)

ISBN13: 978-2-490057-53-5 (Paperback - Print on demand, black and white)

Print on demand technology is a high-quality, innovative and ecological printing method; with which the book is never 'out of stock' or 'out of print'.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data.
A cataloguing record for this book is available from the British Library.

Legal deposit, France: Bibliothèque Nationale de France - Dépôt légal: décembre 2019.